



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/580,365      | 05/26/2000  | Stephen Dao Hui Hsu  | 004828.P001         | 8126             |

7590 05/03/2004

Dennis M De Guzman  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

TRAN, TONGOC

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2134

6

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/580,365

Applicant(s)

HSU ET AL.

Examiner

Tongoc Tran

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 34-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30, 34-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 2134

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to applicants' amendment filed on 2/9/2004.

Claims 1, 6, 16, 20, 24, 28 and 34 are amended. Claims 31-33 are canceled. Claims 1-30 and 34-36 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 2/9/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants' contend that Subramaniam does not teach or suggest that any request sent by the external client whether sent to the border or the target server should include an address comprising "an address of a secure server with an address of a web page concatenated thereto, and the address being at least partially encrypted." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Subramaniam discloses request sent from client to target server (service web page) is redirected from the border server (secure server) for authentication before the web page is sent from the target server to the client through the border server (see Subramaniam, col. 8, lines 12-57, col. 9, lines 18-47). Therefore, it implies that the request from the client must contains the address of the requested web page (the target server address) and the address of the secure server (the border server) in order for the data packet to arrive to its intended destinations.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2134

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, 9-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,900) in view of Munger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135 B1).

In respect to claims 1, 10, 16, 20, 23, 24, 28, 31, 34 and 36, Subramaniam discloses a method, a machine readable medium, an apparatus, and a system, comprising:

“receiving a request including an address, the address comprising an address of a secure server with an address of a web page concatenated thereto” (see col. 7, lines 47-58, col. 8, lines 13-30, col. 9, lines 18-47);

“retrieving a web page designated in the request” (see 6, lines 61-65);

“modifying an address associated with the retrieved web page to indicate an address associated with a secure server that retrieve the web page” (see col. 7, lines 1-20);

“providing an intermediate unit to receive a request for a web page from a terminal; and at a secure server, receiving the request, forward from the intermediate unit” (see col. 6, lines 40-64);

“retrieving the web page designated in the request from a source” (see col. 9, lines 18-30);

sending retrieved web page via a secure link, to a terminal that sent the request (see col. 6, lines 40-51). However, Subramaniam does not disclose encrypting IP address and data associated with the retrieved web page before sending. Munger, on

Art Unit: 2134

the other hand, discloses encrypting an IP packets consisting of messages with a constant IP destination address before sending (see col. 13, lines 45-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the encryption teaching of Munger in sending IP packet in order to provide a more secure data transmission over the network.

In respect to claims 2, 21, 29, 32, and 35, Subramaniam further discloses "the secure link comprises a secure sockets layer (SSL) link". (see col. 3, lines 20-25).

In respect to claims 3 and 22, Subramaniam further discloses "modifying the address associated with the retrieved web page comprises modifying a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) or Internet Protocol (IP) address of a source web site that originated the web page" (see col. 3, lines 17-18 and col. 7, lines 1-20).

In respect to claim 4, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1 further disclose "modifying the address with the retrieved web page comprises modifying an address associated with a hypertext link in the retrieved web page to indicate the address associated with the secure server" (see col. 7, lines 1-20).

In respect to claim 5, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1. Subramaniam further disclose "modifying computer code associated with the retrieved web page to cause subsequent requests related to the retrieved web page to be sent to the secure server instead of to a source web site that originated the web page" (see col. 19, lines 48-56).

In respect to claim 6, 19 and 27, Subramaniam further disclose redirect the address associate with the web page from an address received along with the request

Art Unit: 2134

from the terminal" (see col. 6, lines 40-60). Subramaniam does not disclose decrypting the address of the web page received along with the request. However, Munger discloses encrypting and decrypting a packet that consist of messages with constant IP destination address (see col. 13, line 46-52 and col. 14, lines 14-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teaching of encrypting and decrypting address taught by Munger in order to provide a more secure data transmission over the network.

In respect to claim 7, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1. Subramaniam further discloses "repeating the retrieving, modifying, and sending while the secure link is active" (see col. 6, line 60-col. 7, line 20).

In respect to claim 9, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1. Subramaniam further discloses "at the secure server, controlling transmission of electronic files to the terminal based on preferences received from the terminal" (see col. 6, lines 40-60).

In respect to claim 11, 17, 25 and 33, Subramaniam further discloses "receiving subsequent requests from the terminal at the intermediate unit rather than directly at the secure server from the terminal" (see col. 8, lines 24-30).

In respect to claim 12 and 18, Subramaniam further discloses "receiving subsequent requests from the terminal at the intermediate unit rather than directly at the secure server from the terminal" (see col. 8, lines 24-30).

In respect to claim 13 and 30, Subramaniam further discloses "storing under a pseudonym at a location communicatively couple to the secure server, electronic files

Art Unit: 2134

sent from a web site along with the web pages" (see Fig. 1, item 110, col. 9, lines 32-47, col. 10, line 10-15).

In respect to claim 14, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1. Subramaniam further discloses "obtaining information related to a user's communication with the secure server" (see col. 8, lines 40-46).

In respect to claim 15, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1. Subramaniam further discloses "providing a viewing window at the terminal; displaying the retrieved web page at the viewing window; and providing an interface for subsequent communication with the secure server from the viewing window" (see col. 9, lines 32-40).

In respect to claim 26, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the machine-readable medium of claim 24. Subramaniam further discloses:

"receive subsequent requests from directly the terminal rather than directly at the secure server" (see col. 9, lines 18-20).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,900) and Munger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135 B1) in view of Gampper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,106).

In respect to claim 8, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1.

Subramaniam and Munger do not disclose "triggering a deletion of stored electronic files at the terminal related to a communication via the secure link, in response to termination of the communication". However, Gampper discloses continuously delete files in a local

Art Unit: 2134

cache in order to make room for more recent retrieved web pages (see col. 64-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the continuously deletion of storage to make room for more recent retrieved web pages as taught by Gampper.

### ***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-7690. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.



Art Unit: 2134

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory A. Morse can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner: Tongoc Tran  
Art Unit: 2134

TT  
April 28, 2004

*Matthew Smithers*  
MATTHEW SMITHERS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
*Art Unit 2137*